

**REMARKS**

Claims 1 and 3-7 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 7 are amended, and claim 2 is canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter is added. Support for the claims can be found throughout the specification, including the original claims and the drawings. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-4 and 6-7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Singh et al. (hereinafter "Singh"), U.S. Patent No. 5,150,588, in view of either Smith, U.S. Patent No. 2,575,689, or Cornelius, U.S. Patent No. 3,740,975. Claim 2 is canceled. The rejection is respectfully traversed in so far as it applies to the remaining claims.

The Office Action argues that Singh discloses all of the claimed features of independent claim 1 and "differs from the claim only in the recitation of the predetermined period of time." The Office Action then states that "[t]he patents to Smith (col. 3, lines 61-66) and Cornelius (col. 7, line 48-col. 8, line 6) disclose the predetermined period of time as claimed." The Office Action then concludes that "[i]t therefore would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the device of Singh, to have the pulsator [and] inner tub rotated at a predetermined [period] of time as taught by either Smith or Cornelius, for the purpose of effecting proper agitation for soil removal."

However, Singh discloses an automatic washer including a tub 28, a rotatable basket 26, and a motor 44. Singh performs two washing steps, an initial concentrated washing step and a

Reply to Office Action dated September 12, 2006

second washing step. The washer disclosed by Singh also includes a mechanism 112 that switches an internal path for circulating washing water according to the washing steps. More specifically, during the initial concentrated wash step (which may be considered as corresponding to the claimed centrifugal force washing mode) wherein the basket rotates at a relatively high speed, the washing water reaches a nozzle member 172 through the internal path formed through a center portion of the washer from the tub 27 using a pump 52, and then is discharged into the basket 26 via an opening 174 (see col. 3, line 67–col. 4, line 59). That is, Singh teaches that in the washing mode wherein the washing water is re-circulated into the inner tub via the internal path passing through the inner and outer tubs, such re-circulation is performed by pump 52, not centrifugal force. Accordingly, Singh at least fails to disclose or suggest the claimed centrifugal force washing mode of independent claim 1 in which a created centrifugal force forces the washing water in the inner tub to penetrate through the laundry, to pass through the holes to the outer tub, and to flow upwardly through a space provided between the inner tub and the outer tub so as to recirculate into the inner tub. Further, Singh fails to disclose or suggest the claimed combination of independent claim 1. Smith and Cornelius fail to overcome the deficiency of Singh, as they are merely cited as allegedly teaching the claimed predetermined period of time.

Accordingly, the rejection of independent claim 1 over Singh, Smith, and Cornelius should be withdrawn. Dependent claims 3-4 and 6-7 are allowable over Singh, Smith, and

Reply to Office Action dated September 12, 2006

Cornelius at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, from which they depend, as well as for their added features.

The Office Action rejected claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Singh in view of Smith or Cornelius and further in view of Koo et al. (hereinafter "Koo"), U.S. Patent No. 5,842,358. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Dependent claim 5 is allowable over Singh, Smith, and Cornelius at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, from which claim 5 depends, as well as for its added features. Koo fails to overcome the deficiencies of Singh, Smith, and Cornelius, as it is merely cited for allegedly teaching a rotor surrounding a stator. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 5 over Singh, Smith, Cornelius, and Koo should be withdrawn.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this,

Serial No. **10/724,235**

Docket No. **K-0103B**

Reply to Office Action dated September 12, 2006

concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,  
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP

  
Carol L. Druzbeck  
Registration No. 40,287

P.O. Box 221200  
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200  
(703) 766-3701 CLD/kah

**Date: January 11, 2007**

**Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610**